SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1895.

Locar, News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Passes and New York Associated Passes in at 21 to 29 Ann street. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

The Real Feeling.

A British-born clergyman, addressing an association of natives of Great Britain at a Fifth avenue hotel on Thursday evening, said that a war between America and England would be peculiarly horrible because it would be "a fratricidal conflict." The two countries, he declared, are bound together by "the ties of race and interest" as the children of a common mother."

Even if this were true, it would have no influence in preventing war between the two countries. At the time of the Revolution, when it was true, in large measure, it did not prevent a desperate war, lasting for seven years. It did not prethem from again coming to blows in 1812. Since that period, and more especially during the last fifty years, the population of this country of distinctively English blood has been reduced to a minority; and even of that minority there are comparatively few who cherish any affection toward England. Americans of the Revolutionary stock are usually far from tenderly disposed toward the "common mother." They inherit hatred rather than love of her. The prevailing feeling in this country, inherited by the people coming from other races, is generally very much the same. They have no ties of blood to England, and no affection for her. That is not strange, for nowhere in the world is England loved.

It is this prevalent and practically unanimous American sentiment regarding England, which makes the policy of Mr. CLEVE LAND's message so grateful to our people. If the controversy about Venezuela had arisen with any other country of Europe, it would have provoked comparatively little popular interest. It would not have aroused great public excitement; and hence the settle ment of the difficulty amicably would have been easier. If the improbable, almost impossible, result of the difference should be war between England and America, the appeal to arms would be supported by a national sentiment here which would express a bitterness of hostility never before excheded in the history of war.

That would be a certain consequence of on open rupture between the two countries of which all Englishmen, whether here or a home, should be made to have a full understanding. The talk about fraternal love, and of affection for a common mother. deceives nobody here, and probably few there. There is no such love. The feeling is rather of hatred.

Hence the diplomatic discussion of the Venezuelan question should be throughout cautious and sagacious, with a view to reaching a decision which will command the respect of the American people by reason of its fairness and justice. The peace of the world is at issue in these negotiations concerning a strip of South American territory; and because the issue is so tremendous we assume that they will terminate peacefully. Beware of kindling into a consuming flame the passionate American animoslty toward England!

Sustain the President!

Any American citizen, whether inside or outside of Congress, who hesitates at this conjuncture to uphold the President of the United States, should be branded as an alien or a traitor. The game of politics is out of place to-day. There is no room for any but patriots from Maine to Texas and from Oregon to Florida.

this time. There are crises when lukewarmness is betrayal. By an outburst of approval, which for unanimity is without a parallel in our history, the people of the United States have signified their determination to back their President in the Venezuela business. It was the voice of the nation which was echoed, when by a unique and memorable exception in legislative experience, the course advised by our Chief Magistrate in a matter of tremendous moment received the instant and unanimous assent of the House of Representatives, followed yesterday by that of the Senate, which has shown itself no less sensitive to the wave of enthusiasm which has swept over the republic; no less keenly appreciative of the wise and magnanimous position assumed by the Executive; nor less prompt and single-hearted in its testimony of support

Protean are the disguises of perfidy, but in this instance none of them will avail. The people will see through them all. Awakened as by a' trumpet blast to a sense of its duty and its mission on this continent, the nation cannot be deluded or dismayed. In the eye of public opinion, fixed upon lofty and momentous interests, any attempt at this hour to paralyze the arm of the Executive will seem as shameful as a mutiny at sea. For the moment there is but one chart to follow, one course to steer, one pilot to

obey. The large-minded and righteous policy announced in the President's message will never be disavowed or sidetracked; and our present paramount and urgent business is to make the world understand that this is the unanimous and irrevocable decision of the country. The chariot that bears the MONROE standard will move right on.

No politician and no financier should

imagine that he can boodwink any one as to the character of the motives that may impel him to try to traminel or thwart the President when he gives utterance to the noblest traditions and the highest obligations of a mighty commonwealth. The advocates of peace at any price might as well butt their heads against a rock, as seek to divorce the nation from a programme which windicates its majesty and honor and proclaims its duty and its destiny. He who would have us halt or swerve in the upward path on which we have now entered, is, guilty of egregious folly as well as of a mean

disloyalty. In the world's history there was

guarantee of peace. But for the almost incredible ignorance regarding the feelings and convictions of genuine Americans, in which the people and statesmen of Great Britain have been content to dwell, an ignorance which we have been wont to look upon as ludicrous, but which must now be termed deplorable, Lord Salisbury would never have rejected President CLEVELAND's wellgrounded request for a reference of the Venezuela boundary to arbitration. He would have remembered that a similar boundary controversy, that relating to the island of St. Juan, was He would have recalled the still more pertinent fact that one of his predecessors in the Foreign Office, Lord GRANVILLE, agreed in June, 1885, that this very Venexuela question should be settled by an impartial tribunal. Those precedents would have had their proper weight with any British statesman, charged with grave responsibilities, had he been qualified by an adequate knowledge of this country to foresee that the American people, without distinction of section or of party, and with a burst of unanimity unequalled since the foundation of our Government, would sup-

port Mr. CLEVELAND in the stand made in

his memorable message. What Englishmen knew not, they know now. They will never forget the knowledge, and we believe that they will profit by it. Already there are signs in England that the tide is turning in the direction of common sense, and of a decent recognition of the fact that, if the claims of British Gui ana are just, they can have nothing to fear from an impartial tribunal. The London Chronicle, which has kept its head, while its contemporaries have shown as much fury and bewilderment as if a sheep had bitten them, has twice within a week declared that "the American suggestion of a reference to umpires is not unreasonable," and regards it as of "vital consequence" to all concerned that "the controversy shall as far as possible further rather than retard the principle of international arbitration." As the days pass and forethought spreads, a larger and larger number of sober-minded Englishmen are likely to agree with Prof. GOLDWIN SMITH, who, without attempting, any more than Mr. CLEVELAND has done, to prejudge the merits of the Venezuelan question, recognizes that all boundary controversies, instead of being unadapted, are oreëminently suited for arbitration.

Alike for those who desire peace and for those who fear not war, there is one duty and one watchword: Sustain the President

The Case of France and Brazil.

It is worth noting that there exists at this time a boundary dispute between French Guiana and Brazil wholly comparable with the one between British Guiana and Venezuela. The two controversies, however, have this fundamental point of difference that while England refuses to put hers before an arbiter, as it stands, France, if we may credit the words just attributed to M. DELONCLE, "has long been demanding the arbitration of her dispute with Brazil."

The more closely these two cases are ex mined the more remarkable is the parallel in their details, and the more emphatic, therefore, the contrast presented by the refraining of France from encroachment upon the disputed area, and her desire not to settle its ownership by the law of the stronger. In both cases the controversy stends back for centuries to days who lack of geographical knowledge led to vague terms of description in grants and treaties. In both cases the coast as well as the in terior is in dispute, the Amapa or Counani district, over which France and Brazil contend, lying between the Oyapock and Amapa rivers. Finally, in both cases the controversy has become acute within a short time through the discovery of rich gold fields on the disputed tract.

In the Counani district, too, as in the Yurdari or Caratal district, the influx of miners and others from the neighboring Guiana colony has led to disputes and open violence. The Cayenne authorities have more to talk about, in some respects, so far as acts of violence demanding reparation are concerned, than those of Georgetown. As we all know, the claim of Lord SALIS BURY upon Venezuela, said to be for \$60,000, as if \$6,000 were not ample, if anything is due at all, rests upon what was at most a slight offence. A couple of Britsh colonial police authorities were ar rested, wrongfully they assert, by local authorities. They were promptly released by the Caracas Government, and it is said that compensation was offered them for any injuries to their clothing, or otherwise, they might have received. It was a minor mat ter. But in the case of Brazil the French Capt. TRAJAN, who commanded the force of armed police stationed by the French Guiana authorities at Carsevenne, in the disputed mining tract, was seized and was imprisoned at Mapa. This, in turn, led to an attack at Mapa, as the story goes, by an armed vessel

sent by the Governor of Cayenne. Yet not only has the question of indem nity on the one side or the other been allowed to wait during the settlement of the boundary dispute, but, so far as we have observed, no demands have been formulated either by France or Brazil, at least to the extent of demanding specified sums. It seems to have been recognized as a matter of course that these conflicts, which were far more severe than the trivial affair on the Uruan, resulting, indeed, in blood shed and loss of life, had arisen out of the boundary dispute, and should, as far as possible, be subordinated to the latter. The contrast between this course of conduct and Lord Salisbury's demands in the Uruan case, especially if it is to be enforced by a

British fleet, is apparent. And there is one more contrast to be noted in the methods of adjustment employed in these two boundary disputes otherwise so closely parallel. Half a century and more ago, in the year 1841, just about the time that SCHOMBURGE was drawing his arbitrary line through Venezuela, France and Brazil signed a modus vivendi of peace. The former had, during four or five years preceding, established a military post within territory which Brazil considered as hers, but, on Brazil's demand, evacuated it in 1840. Then the two countries proceeded to agree that the contested territory should remain neutral, and so it has been until this day. Without discuss never a conjuncture at which an unflinching ing the accusations of one or the other that readiness for war offered a more certain | encroachments have lately been made upon | amination of the charges filed with Gov. | SULZER'S joint resolution should receive

it, we may say that it has been practically held as territory whose ownership was in doubt. So far has this policy been carried that several years ago some of the people of Counani even took steps to set up an independent republic there, until warned by France and Brazil, acting jointly, that these

countries held jurisdiction there. Of course the question of real ownership ought to be settled there as in Venezuela, since a boundary dispute is a cause of friction and peril; and it ought to be settled by peaceful arbitration. But the point to note is that while France seeks such arbitration, she does not begin by drawing a line to which Brazil has never consented through the middle of the disputed tract, saysubmitted by England to arbitrators, ing that she must have everything up to that line to start with, before she will arbitrate as to the rest. The whole question is open, and that, too, in spite of the acknowledged fact that French settlers and miners are on the disputed tract. They went there at their own risk, and France, it appears, will allow an impartial arbiter to say whether they are on Brazilian or French soil.

> Our Comical but Worthless Sheriff. The ludicrous outcome of the DAMSEN trial in the Court of General Sessions was in perfect harmony and keeping with all that the public knows about Damsen. It was not to be supposed that any matter or affair with which he might be prominently connected could terminate otherwise than in an amusing bungle. In this case DAMSEN was the most prominent personage. He was the prisoner in the dock, and the wheels of justice were clogged with pretzels. Since Jan. 1, DAMSEN has been Sheriff of New York. His official record has been a long but amusingly diversified chapter of errors and blunders, some venial, some serious, but all of them laughable. There have been escapes from custody, evasions of court orders, blunders in the service of jury notices, a scandal over the appointment of the Sheriff's auctioneers, accusations of discrimination and favoritism, the appointment of incompetent persons, the appointment of one or more persons awaiting trial under criminal indictment, and, finally, last and worst of all, extortionate overcharges, in excess of the statutory allowance, for the services of the auctioneers' combine. Of the inability of DAMSEN to render to

the people of New York any adequate return

for the \$20,000 a year which the people are

taxed to pay him, there can be no doubt whatever; and the jury which failed to reach a conclusion in the Court of General Sessions on Thursday probably had no doubt of his culpable incompetence. But the question directly before them related to a specific act, or failure to act, of DAMSEN, whereby the three Federal prisoners, KIL-LORAN, RUSSELL, and ALLEN, escaped from Ludlow street jail on July 4. The theory of the prosecution may be reduced to this: Three prisoners under DAMSEN's custody having escaped, fled, departed, lit out, gone, ausgebrochen, their jailer should be incarcerated as a substitute, a vicarious sacrifice, as it were. Three having gone out, one should be put in. Such seemed to be the cruel logic of the law, but how could it be made to apply in DAMSEN's case! KILLORAN, RUSSELL, and ALLEN, though engaged in the detestable and lawless business of cracksmen, breaking into and pilfering Post Offices, were, as the testimony disclosed to the jury, intelligent and wide-awake men. They understood the language of the United States, the topography of the country, the location of its public buildings, and the whereabouts of the officers of justice. The laws, Federal and State, which persistently and perniciously they were breaking, were well known to them. To the extent that such a comparison is permissible, it may be said that they were adepts at the business to which the devoted themselves. What sort of a substitute for them in a jail would DAMSEN make? He is not alert, wide awake, or intelligent. He does not speak the English he does not know the customs of the country, he is unfamiliar with the location of the public buildings even in this city, he knows little of the laws of the United States or of the State of New York he is without cleverness, cunning, or skill. A score of DAMSENS could not replace a single KILLOBAN, RUSSELL, or ALLEN.

Again, the specific charge against DAM-SEN, about which the jury in the Court of General Sessions disagreed, was technical in its character. The Sheriff-notary DAMSEN speaks Plattdeutsch; his barber-Warden RAABE speaks Hochdeutsch. DAMSEN gave instructions for the care of the jail in Plattdeutsch. RAABE imperfectly and inaccurately understood them. The divergence was not one of intent, but one of idlom; and where is there in the city of New York, or in Long Island City or Hoboken either, a man with so much bitterness, venom, and vindictiveness in his heart that, sitting on a jury and serving under oath, he would be willing to incarcerate in a dungeon a man like Damsen, whose grievous error it was to suppose that a Fifth street barber could omprehendingly translate and interpret the instructions of an Avenue A notary in a language essentially different from his own ?

The difficulty, too, of taking DAMSEN seriously seems to have perplexed the General Sessions jury. Here was a listless and ludicrous Holstein Dane, with bair and whiskers shrouding and concealing every part of his head but his chin, seated in a chair and so frequently mistaken for one of the court attendants that it was necessary for counsel to point to him to make sure of his identity. A jury, not chosen from among the ranks of those favored men who have lively imaginations and supersharpened sensibilities, was asked to believe that this individual was the same as the candidate chosen high Sheriff and peace officer of this town by a majority of the citizens only a little more than a year ago. Gen. TRACY in his eloquent and instructive argument did not, it is true, raise the question of an alibi for DAMSEN, but the sober sense of the discriminating jurors may have supplied the omission, and those of them who did not vote to convict may have faltered in this because of their belief that there were two DAMSENS. But we assure them that in this they err; there is only one DAMSEN.

The people of the city of New York are not particularly interested in the punishment of DAMSEN. What they seek is wha they are paying for, namely, a competent, coherent, and intelligible Sheriff, who will carry out in a watchful, decorous, and proper manner the orders of the Court, and keep in safe custody such prisoners as are committed to his care. Had the General Sessions jury which disagreed on Thursday convicted DAMSEN, he would either have been sent to prison or fined. If he had been fined, who knows but some of the counterfeit money referred to by old Bill Vosburg in his testimony, would have been offered by sympathetic German Reform admirers of DAMSEN, in trustful ignorance of its worthless character? If he had been imprisoned, the exernor MORTON by the Hon. HENRY GRASSE and his associate taxpayers, would necessarily have been deferred till the expiration of DAMSEN's term of incarceration. The speedy relief which the people of this city look to Governor MORTON to give them in Damsen's case would have been postponed. The action of the jury in the General Sessions case opens up clearly the way to a consideration of these charges by the Governor, and there is no reason to believe that the

matter will be longer delayed. DAMSEN is booked to go. Go he must; and it is a matter of very little difference to the citizens of this town how he goes, providing they are relieved of him.

DAMSEN must go!

The University of Virginia. To everything there is a season, and a time

to every purpose The Christmas time is of all the year the season when people think the most of giving good gifts to others. As the Christmas of 1895 approaches there are particular reasons why the scores and hundreds and thousands of Southern-born men who have acquired fortunes in the North during the last quarter of a century should remember the University of Virginia, in the benefactions by which they may desire to manifest their good will toward that portion of the land which gave them birth.

In October last the rotunds of the university and its wings were destroyed by fire, the damage amounting to about \$150,000. The college authorities estimate that the restoration of the buildings, the reestab lishment of the library, much of which was destroyed, and the other improvements ren dered advisable in consequence of the fire, will cost about \$350,000, of which \$220, 000 is yet to be raised. The sum of \$58,000 is available from insurance and other resources, and the Chairman of the faculty has already received subscriptions which amount to \$72,000. The Legislature of Virginia will undoubtedly afford some aid, but without further assistance from individuals the sum necessary to maintain the university worthily cannot be obtained.

The appeal addressed to the alumni and friends of the institution by the commit tee on the restoration fund ought to strike a responsive chord even among those of Northern birth and associations. The University of Virginia is the most interest ing institution of learning in the South. It was founded in 1819 by THOMAS JEFFERSON, who designed the original buildings at Charlottesville, and superin tended their erection. Of all the great works of his life, JEFFERSON was most proud of this, as is shown by the inscription which he ordered to be placed over his tomb: 'Father of the University of Virginia.' DANIEL WEBSTER, in his famous oration on ADAMS and JEFFERSON in Fancuil Hall in August, 1826, referred to the university, then only seven years old, in these words:

"There remained to Mr. JEFFERSON yet one other ork of patriotism and beneficence, the establishmen of a university in his native State. To this object he devoted years of incessant and anxious attention, and by the enlightened liberality of the Legislature of Virginia, and the cooperation of other able and real ous friends, he lived to see it accomplished. May all as attend this infant semipary; and may the who enjoy its advantages, as often at their eyes shall rest on the neighboring height, recollect what they owe to their disinterested and indefatigable benefac tor; and may letters honor him who thus labored in he cause of letters!

The institution in which JEFFERSON was thus interested at the beginning of the century ought to interest at the end of the century all those who admire the genius and reverence the memory of that great man. And in the North as well as in the South, in the East as well as in the West, there must be many who are both able and willing to assist the University of Virginia when they become aware of its recent trial and its present need.

Silly Decorations for Sailors.

The Constitution of the United States provides that no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without consent of Congress, accept a present, emolument, office, or title of any kind from any king, prince, or foreign State.

On the first day of the present session of Congress, Mr. TURPLE of Indiana introduced in the Senate a bill authorizing the persons therein named to accept certain decorations and testimonials from the late Hawaiian Government. These are the persons and decorations named in the bill:

Rear Admiral GEORGE BROWN, U. S. N., Knight Grand officer of the Royal Order of Kalakaua Ensign Grossus P. Blow, U. S. N., Royal Order of Kalakaua.

Lieut, George S. Dyer, U. S. N., Knight Companior of the Royal Order of Kalakaua FRANK LAVIERE, United States steamer Charleston

medal of honor. Сарі. Geonos C. Rener, U. S. N., Kuight Commander of the Royal Order of Kalakaua Medical Inspector GRORGE W. WOODS, U. S. N., Roya

Mr. TURPIE's bill states that these various decorations were conferred in recognition of services to the late King of the Hawalian Islands. Some of these services appear to have been rendered upon the occasion of the King's visit to California. We are at a loss to understand, however, why any officers of the United States navy should perform 'services" of any kind for anybody but the Government of the United States.

The term as used in the bill, however, probably means hospitable attention, rather than anything else. But surely it is not worthy of a naval officer to accept decorations simply for playing the agreeable host. We can understand that Congress should allow an officer in the military or naval service of this country to accept a decoration for any act of courage or her-oism which chances to be beneficial to a foreign Government; such, for example, as saving life at sea, aiding in the protection of foreigners during a riot, or omething of that sort. It seems to us only degrading, however, to permit them to wear medals of an obsolete and semi-savage monarchy, really conferred in recognition. not of any military or marine quality, but simply because they fed a dusky King well and treated him with courtesy.

Justice and Freedom for Cuba

Mr. SULZER of New York has introduced in the House of Representatives the joint resolution which opens the way for justice and freedom to the Cuban revolutionists:

"That the Government of the United States recog nizes a condition of public war between the Govern ment of Spain and the Government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and the United States of ries hereby declare that they will main tain a condition of strict neutrality betwee the contending powers and accord to each a the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States. The Congress of the United States protest and remonstrate against the barbarou manner in which the war in Cuba has been conducted and the President is hereby authorized to take such steps as may be expedient, in his judgment, to secur rvance of the laws of war as recognized by all

This resolution has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As soon as that committee shall be constituted. Mr.

prompt consideration, and should come back to the House with a ringing recom mendation that it be adopted.

The Senate should pass it likewise, and GROVER CLEVELAND should sign it.

The critical character of our relations with England on the Venezuela question should not prevent or delay this act of justice, this pledge of friendship, and this signal of hope to the heroes of Cuba's war of independence.

What a picture the Jingoes present as they fall in line "behind CLEVELAND," whom for months and years they have been denouncing as the exponent of all that was most detestable in American statesmanship.—New York Evening Post.

What a picture, indeed! It is inspiring to every American heart. And to think, Gonkin. that Mr. CLEVELAND might have had this glorious and invincible band behind him all the lime, if he had kicked you down the back stairs three years earlier!

Perhaps the Detroit Dry Dock Company and F. W. WHEELER & Co. of Bay City and all the other enterprising and patriotic shipbuilders or the great lakes may yet have an opportunity to show what their shippards can do,

Enter again in the classic town of Long Island City, the Hon. PATRICK GLEASON, Mayor Other statesmen come to a stop, but GLEASON keeps on and on, and Long Island City loves him. He is a hustler. He is an axeman. He is America's Gladstone, except that Mr. Glad-STONE has retired from public life. His shadow grows with years, and he has elements of a reat man. We salute as is proper the rightful Mayor of a sister city.

THE MESSAGE CRITICISED.

One Respect in Which Mr. Cleveland's Po-sition Is Not Monroish Enough. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Now, that the surprise and gratification over the assertion of any degree of patriotic sentiment from Grover Cleveland has found expression in a very universal approval, it is worth while, perhaps, to consider one of the propositions advanced, and to question whether it is, in fact, such an interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine as is likely to meet with the approval of the people in after years, when a contingency may arise, which, happily, is not probable in this In discussing the refusal of England to submit its boundary dispute to arbitration, the President says:

" Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though apy adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, he objected to by the United States."

Is this the Monroe Doctrine? Is the United States Government prepared to assert the doctrine that European powers, playing upon the temporary Governments of South America, may extend their systems to this continent at will. and without objection on the part of the United States? This certainly is not the language of the Monroe Doctrine. It declares:

"We owe it, therefore, to cardor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace

This language was intended to be addressed to the "Holy Alliance," but it asserts the proposition that we will not look with favor upon the extension of European systems; and, continuing, it says:

" With the existing colonies or depende European power we have not interfered, and will not nterfere. But with the Governments who have delared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to ward the United States."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States:" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny," would be a sufficient cause for regarding the action as an evidence of an unfriendly attitude toward the United States. Again, Mr. Monroe says in his celebrated message:

"It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own second. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition, in any form, with indifference."

Mr. Cass, in the course of an elaborate speech on Jan. 25, 1856, took very strong grounds, and regarded the Monroe Doctrine not only as a declaration against European intervention or future colonization, but against the acquisition of dominion on this continent by European owers, by whatever mode or however derived. "It does not contemplate," says Secretary Fish, "forcible intervention in any legitimate contest; but it protests against permitting such a contest to result in the increase of European power or influence; and it ever impels this Government, as in the late contest between the South American republics and Spain, to interpose its good offices to secure an honorable peace."

It appears, therefore, that this much of the resident's message is not in harmony with the Monroe Doctrine, for there is no utterance, other in the doctrine itself or in the elaborate discussion which it has caused in diplomatic the right of the South American countries to oncede the right of European powers to extend their systems or their influence in that quarter of the globe; and conditions may arise where it will be highly expedient for this Government to interfere to prevent just such a result as Mr. Cleveland suggests. We could not, for instance, ook with favor upon the ceding of one of the States of Mexico to England in consideration of that nation assuming the indebtedness of the Mexican republic; and what is true of Mexico is true more or less of all of the countries lying to the south and having in a measure a destiny

in common with the United States, While, therefore, there should be no hesita tion on the part of the Congress to authorize the President to appoint his Commission of inquiry. it should be coupled with a distinct denial of the proposition enunciated by the President. and which is not necessary to this controversy, that Venezuela has a right to concede territor to England which that country has no moral or legal right to claim. That much of the message is in a measure a denial of the Monroe Doctrine, and it ought not, in the enthusiasm of the moment, to receive Congressional sanction, to arise some day to vex and embarrass us in the adjustment of other complications.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., Dec. 19. BEN S. DEAN.

To the Epiton of The Scs-Sir: I would like to mow whether under the Monroe doctrine or any other principle of our foreign policy territory can be ceded by any Government in this hemisphere to a Euro by any Government in this hemisphore to a European power without the consent of the United States. For instance, would we be entitled to protest against the stander by Spain of Cuba to Great Britain, or central this Government bawe interposed against the purchase by the inster Government of Alaska from Russia, had such been contemplated. By idea of the Monroe doctrine is that it opposes the acquisition of American territory by any foreign power, only where such is attempted against the consent of its inhabitants. I am forced to seek information from TRE SUS, as my oracle, the Zuening Post, is temporarily demented. New York, Dec. 19.

The United States flatters itself that it s no fool, any more than other nations. We should object to a country like England acquirmethod of transfer. This is the doctrine of the Monroe proclamation was a particular man-

Every Thirty-five Years,

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUR-Sir: Have you notice his? The war of 1776 was followed by the war of iniar the war of 1716 was followed by the war of 1812—thirty-six years after—and that by the Mexican war of 1848, also thirty-six years after 1812. This was such an easy one that we had to have a big one among ourselves in 1850. Now, thirty-five years after, we are verging toward a scrimmage with somebody class.

THE AMERICAN DOCTRINE.

Thomas Jefferson's as Well as James Monroe's.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: The President's message on the Venezuela question has received such a practically unanimous and enthusiastic support from all parts of the United States and from all classes of citizens, rrespective of mere political differences, as to show clearly that the patriotic American spirit has been aroused in defence of a doctrine dear

to Americans. It is to be regretted that the message did not contain a fuller statement of the reasons why the Monroe doctrine may be considered as having "its place in the code of international lay as certainly and as securely as if it were particularly mentioned," because the Europea press, from want of better information, are denying the statement.

President James Monroe announced the doctrine in his annual message to Congress on Dec. 2, 1823. It was the outgrowth of suggestions previously made by Mr. Secretary Canning. British Minister of Foreign Affairs, to Mr. Richard Rush, the Minister Plenipotentiary of

the United States at the Court of St. James's. In his message, after alluding to various matters of foreign and domestic concern, President Monroe, in the course of his development of the American doctrine to which his name is now in-

separably attached, used these words: In the wars of the European powers, in ma relating to themselves, we have never taken any par nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defence. With the movements in this hemi here we are, of necessity, more immediately con ted, and by causes which must be obvious to all nlightened and impartial observers.

The political system of the aiffed powers is ess tially different in this respect from that of America The difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments. And to the defen our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure and matured by the wis-dom of our most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed an unexampled felicity, this

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to an portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependen cies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere.

But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose indepen dence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, ter could not view any interpos tion for the purpose of oppressing them, or contri in any other manner their destiny by any Europea power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

President Monroe further amplified on this question, but the above quotation sufficiently indicates its fixed intent.

The Congress of Verona of 1822 had led to an armed interference by France, under sanction of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, in the internal affairs of Spain. The Spanish Constitution. which the Cortes had established, had accordingly been overthrown and Ferdinand VII. restored to absolute power, and it was suppose an attempt would be made by the allied powers to reduce to subjection all the Central and South American States which had revolted against Spanish misrule and had set up inde-

Before President Monroe put forth his celebrated message he had referred Mr. Secretary Canning's proposal to ex-President Thomas Jefferson. The Sage of Monticello, in the course of his reply, dated Oct. 24, 1823, said:

Our first maxim should be never to entangle our selves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with Cisatiantic affairs." He advised President Monroe to join with Great Britain in a declaration, and was posi-tive in his conviction that, except as to the inefective efforts of Spain to subdue her revolted colonies, we should "oppose with all our means the forcible interposition of any other power as auxiliary, stipendiary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in

President Monroe's declaration was a decisive support to Great Britain in her declaration against the outcome of the Congress of Verona and put an end to all designs of the allied powers to subdue the Spanish-American republics. The late Lord Brougham said of President Monroe's message, that "none has ever dispersed greater joy, exultation, and gratitude over all the free men of Europe," and Sir James Mackintosh said that it could not "be contemplated without the utmost pleasure by every

enlightened citizen on the earth." Russia, Great Britain, and the United States were the three great powers which then controlled the continent of North America, and the United States has since succeeded to all the rights of Russia. The principle of the Monro doctrine is accepted by the Central and South American republics as essential to their auton-

omy. Time and again have the principal powers o Europe combined to lay down principles concerning their own continent, to which all nations have been required to give heed, under the plea of the general balance of power and the peace of Europe.

The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818; the intervention in the Ottoman Empire in 1840. and in the Relgic revolution of 1830, which resulted in the separation of that country fro Holland; the treaties of Paris of 1856, which guaranteed the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire, and practically closed the Dardanelles to the ships of war of all other nations, are all familiar examples of interventions and acts sanctioned by the law of nations

President Monroe declared what acts by foreign power against a Spanish-American republic on this hemisphere should be deemed untherefor.

No general rule has ever yet been formulated in public international law concerning the general right of interference which would be applicable to every case.

The sincerely honest, candid, and weighty reasons put forth by President Monroe in 1823. in support of his declaration of a principle of public international law as applicable to this hemisphere, will ever receive the enthusiastic and potential support of Americans, as Geo III. styled the people of the United States in the treaty of 1783, and the sconer the administration of Lord Salisbury recognizes this serious fact the better it will be for the peace of the ASA BIRD GARDINER.

NEW YORK, Dec. 20.

To the Editor of The Sun-Sir: The clergymen who for many years have been denouncing in this country what they term the "Imprudence" and the "sinfuiness" of resistance to British power may pos saints, but they can never pose as sages. Go priests necessarily make bad politicians. The gentle men above referred to present conspicuous r this assertion. Consecrated constables of t they have brought their British policy with then from Ireland, where their reverend brothers as drowning the manhood of the country in the hol drowing the manh-od of the country in the holy water of elernal submission. Apparently obeying orders from head-quarters, these same gentlemen here in the United States have for years, openly and secretly, been attacking all the enemies of England within their reach, and if from this Venezuela question we derive no greater benefit than the setback of the political power of England's loyal priests, that at least will be something to be thankful for.

NEW YORE, Dec. 20.

CASTLEBAR.

To the Editor of The Six-Six: The war between he United States and Great Britain is sure to come. Last year the seventeen year locusts had a great W their wings. I never knew the sign to fail. Before the

Between Twinger. From the Boston Herald. For a victim of the gout the Mayor of New York is a

An Obliging Public Functionary. From the Florida Times Union On the door of Fries's drug store is a sign, ose the door." Just under it is snoth Closed by the Sheriff."

Give attention to the first symptoms of a lung oplaint, and check the dreaded disease in its include by using Dr. D. Jayne's Expectorant, a safe, old-fast dreimedy for all affections of the lungs and brond the check family Pill—Jayne's Painless Sanative.—

NEW BOOKS.

Brief Reviews of Important and Interesting Thomas Hardy's new novel, "Jude the On-

scure" (Harper & Brothers), is a study of an un-

usual interchange of husbands and wives, Jude and Phillotson and Sue and Arabella are

a queer lot, and it cannot be said that they are exactly nice, though there is nothing in particullar against Phillotson. The ability of work. manship in this novel does not, in our opinion, compensate for the queerness and the gloom; still, notoriously and to the great good fortune of story tellers, tastes differ, and we have no idea that either the queerness or the gloom will seem objectionable to everybody. If we were called upon to describe the tale plainly according to our own impressions, we should feel ourselves constrained in candor to say certain derogatory things about it. It is, as we think, ormal and hysterical tale, and we have found it wearisome as well as extravagant and unhealthy. There is no agreeable person in it, and if there is any cheerful incident or sentiment we do not at this moment recall it. There is indeed, the incident-and the possible sentiment-where Arabella, washing pig's offal in the brook throws a piece at Jude, in order to attract his attention. That is the beginning of the peculiar love story of Arabella and Jude. and it may suggest itself as a cheerful incident to some, but in our impression it is an incident of emphasis rather than of cheerfulness, and rather than of delicacy. The eroticism in the story is perhaps not as much as has been rumored; but whatever has been said of its quality can hardly have been exaggerated, for Mr. Hardy has here exercised a peculiar ingenuity that has left little of grossness unapplied. It must be said, however, that the characters in the story have amiable qualities. The renunciations and accommodating adjustments and readjustments on the part of Jude, the stonecutter, and Phillotson, the schoolmaster, in matters involving the sexual relation, are among the most remark. able of such evidences, either in or out of fiction, and Mr. Hardy has permitted an equal amiability in this particular to Arabella and Sue. Whose wife is whose, and who is whose wife, in the final pages of the story, is certainly one of the most difficult problems that have ever confronted a reader, and it is no wonder that "Jude the Obscure " ends in tragedy or that it should be so entitled. It is not to be denied that Sue, the wife of Jude and twice the wife of Phillotsonlikewise at one time the roommate in platonism of the Oxford undergraduate who wrote editorials for the London newspapers and died early—is possessed of a certain great interest arising from the circumstance that she is the nost learned and sarcastic young woman in all fiction; but what a hysteria she has, and how thoroughly convinced one is at the end of the book that she ought to have been switched early and often! Why Sue didn't write exceptional books of history and philosophy or extraordinary manuals of architecture and archmology, or why she didn't expand the works of Voltairs or collaborate with Col. Ingersoll, is something not easy to determine. She was perfectly fitted for these occupations, and that she should have neglected them in order to bother herself about the sacramental rights of Phillotson, or about the sacramental rights of Jude's original wife, the pig farmer's daughter, who left Jude for a publica in the antipodes, must be forever strange. Of ourse, it was a great strain on Sue's nerves, as it would have been, indeed, on the nerves of any woman similarly situated, when Arabella's little boy by Jude hanged himself by the neck to a hook in the closet after hanging by their necks to other books in the closet his little halfbrothers, Jude's other children by Sue, and it is no wonder, perhaps, that she should have thought it best at this juncture to go back to Phillotson; but before she knew either Jude or Phillotson she was guilty of the death of the undergraduate who wrote editorials, and when she made that fatal essay n platonism she was in whatever of right mind she was ever possessed of, and there was no excuse for her. However, it occurs to us that it is hardly worth while to reason about Sue, or wen to wonder at her. She, like all the other characters in the book, was responsible only to Mr. Hardy, and had nothing to do but to move in accordance with his sombre and strange magiuings. It is curious to think of these unexalted characters uttering his subtleties and working them out in their lives. It must be insisted, too, that it is exceedingly depressing. One long hears Sue, after her return to Phillotson, tearing her openwork nightgown to pieces. "She took it," Mr. Hardy says, "and began rending it with all her might, the tears resounding through the house like a screech owl." It was a favorite garment with Jude, and for that reason she rent it. "It is adultarous!" she cried. "It signifies what I don't feel-I bought it long ago-to please Jude. It must be destroyed?" This was shortly after she had gone to the abandoned Jude in a white fog and carried him off for a visit to the cemetery, and not long before Jude's lonely death, which occurred while the frivolous Ara bella, whose husband he happened at that time and for the second time to be, was off at a boating party. As one looks back over it, it is not difficult to discover why the story has a sombre tone. A potable feature of the book is the account of Oxford, called here "Christminster and the satire of its religious character and its ecclesiastical worthles. If Mr. Hardy is not always cheerful, neither is he invariably reverential, and one needs only to read what he here says about the great English university in order to find it out. The two bound volumes of Scribner's Magazine for 1895 are another of the particularly delight-

ful evidences of the holiday season, and it is not likely that anybody who sees these handsome and valuable books will fall to be alive to their great attractions. Some of the best things of the year's literature have appeared in Scribner's, and to turn the pages of these two volumes is to e gratified and delighted, and to be made grateful to those who have been concerned in bringing them forth. Among the many books that press for attention at this time, these surely will ot be overlooked.

We have received from the Messrs, Putnam The Gold Diggings of Cape Horn," by John R. spears; "Love and Laughter," a volume of coms by the late James G. Burnett, the actor, with an introduction by William Winter; "Con gressional Currency: an Outline of the Federal Money System," by Armistead C. Gordon; 'Sketches from Concord and Appledore," by Frank Preston Stearns, and "Nymphs, Nixies, and Naiads," legends of the Rhine in verse, by

"Dumb in June," poems, by Richard Burton, and "A Doric Reed," by Zitelia Cocke, are published by Copeland & Day, Boston; and a picturesque limited edition of Wilfrid Scaw-a Blunt's admirable poems, "Esther" and the "Love Sonnets of Proteus," is issued by the same publishers. "John Hare, Comedian," a blography, by T.

Edgar Pemberton, is published by George R edge & Bons. "Death Valley in '49; Autobiography of Ploneer," by William Lewis Manley, is pub-

ished for the author in San José. The Funk & Wagnalls Company publish in a arge new edition"A Library of Religious Focts a Collection of the Best Poems of All Ages and longues," with biographical and literary motes, edited by Dr. Philip Schaff and Arthur Gilmani also the first of three volumes of "The Reader's Shakespeare; His Dramatic Works Condensed. Corrected, and Emphasized," by David Charles Bell. Shakespeare's works "emphasized" is

good; it invites speculation and opinion. "Mars," by Percival Lowell, the result of a study of the planet made at Flagstaff, Ariz. during the last opposition, in 1894-'95, will many illustrations, is published by Hought ...

Macmillan & Co. publish "An Artist in the Himalayas," an account of travel, by A. D. N. Cormick, with many sketches by the author and "The Quest of the Absolute," translated Ellen Marriage, in the handsome new edition he Balzac novels.

Von Scheffel's historical novel, "Ekkehard," ranslated from the German, with all the notes of the 138th edition, is published handson with the German illustrations, by Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

" Macaire; a Melodramatic Farce," by Hobert